

THE EFFECT OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON WRITING PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS IN INTENSIVE COURSE

Pipit Suci Anggriani
English Language Teaching Study Program
Postgraduate, Universitas Islam Malang, Indonesia
Email: Pipitsuci2nd@gmail.com

Abstract

The effect of direct and indirect written corrective feedback has long been debated among the teachers and researchers. The previous studies have also been conducted and found the different results that have not been settled. It still becomes a big question, therefore the researcher conducts the same study in the different level, in non-formal education. This study aims are to find out which written corrective feedback is more effective in improving writing performance of the students and to verify the previous studies about the effectiveness of both feedback. The design of this study is a true experimental research. 21 students in intensive course participated in this study. They were divided into two groups. 10 students in experimental group One were given direct written corrective feedback and 11 students in experimental group Two were given indirect written corrective feedback. In analyzing the data the researcher used Independent sample T-test. The findings revealed that the students who are given direct written corrective feedback achieve significantly better ($p: .002$) writing performance than the students who are given indirect written corrective feedback. It means direct written corrective feedback is more effective in improving writing performance than indirect written corrective feedback.

Keywords: writing performance, direct feedback, indirect feedback.

INTRODUCTION

Many English foreign learners assume that writing is not the essential skill to be understood completely. It is because they do not know if having a good ability in writing reflects that they have good English because they could use their idea, structure, vocabulary, spelling, and knowledge, to produce the products of language. It also makes us easy in many ways such as for applying job or scholarship, making a journal or thesis as the requirement to get the degree and making a daily project.

Writing is not easy to be mastered therefore it is possible for them to make errors. Giving feedback is the way to assist them in learning writing. Bitchener and Ferris (2012) classified written corrective feedback into direct written corrective feedback and indirect written corrective feedback. Direct written corrective feedback occurs when teachers mark the error and provide the correction whereas indirect written corrective feedback marking the error by the teacher and not providing the correction then letting students to correct it by themselves.

The effectiveness of feedback especially direct and indirect written corrective feedback has been controversy among the researchers for years. They found different results that have not been settled. It still becomes a big question. Farjadnasab and Khodashenas (2017), Elham (2014), and Goksoy (2016), showed a positive correlation between students' writing accuracy and teachers' feedback. Riani (2016) stated direct and indirect written feedback assist to improve the writing ability of the students. Salimi and Ahmadvpour (2015) showed direct written

corrective feedback has better effect in long term than indirect written corrective feedback. It was supported by the findings of Jamalinesari (2015) that indirect feedback was less effective than direct feedback. While Baleghizadeh & Dadashi (2011) claimed that in improving the writing of the students, direct feedback was less effective than indirect feedback provision.

Therefore it cannot be concluded which written corrective feedback can assist the students in writing. Mostly researchers conducted the research in various nations in the formal education with the students at Junior School, senior school and University as the participants. They also have a big number of participants. Because of that fact, the researcher decided to do the same research to plan on finding out which written corrective feedback has a better impact to improve writing performance of the students and to verify the previous studies about the effectiveness of both written corrective feedback.

Based on the fact stated in the background above, the researcher formulates the research question "Do the students who are given direct written corrective feedback achieve significantly better writing performance than those who are given indirect written corrective feedback?". Therefore the objective of this research is to investigate the effectiveness of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on writing performance of the students.

Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback

Feedback means the respond and interacting between the teacher and the students as the activity in teaching process. Feedback is able to assist the students in fixing their error, improving their writing ability and not doing the same error. In relation to the objective of this study, the distinction between direct feedback and indirect feedback is made. Both written corrective feedback are popular to be used in teaching writing, therefore we can find many references and research about those feedback. It could be seen in the classification of feedback by Bitchener and Ferris (2012). They classified corrective feedback to be direct and indirect written corrective feedback.

Direct written corrective feedback occurs when teachers mark the error and provide the correction whereas indirect written corrective feedback is marking the error by the teacher and not providing the correction then letting students to correct it by themselves. It could be said that direct written corrective feedback is feedback giving the mark, circle, or underline to the students errors on writing and providing the right correction. Whereas indirect written corrective feedback is feedback given to the students by giving the mark, underline, or circle without providing the correct form, but letting the students identify the error and correct it by themselves. It is supported by Ferris (2011) that direct feedback is marking errors afterwards providing correction, while indirect feedback is marking errors without providing the correction and letting errors to be revised by the students. The teacher will mark the errors and give an explanation to the students why he or she marks and say it is incorrect then he or she gives the correct form of error. Giving the mark and correction is what we call direct written corrective feedback.

Meanwhile in indirect written corrective feedback the teacher does not give the correction on students' writing directly, the correct answer will be done by the students. The teachers only give the mark, circle or underline on the students' errors. Therefore students given indirect written corrective feedback are able to know what their errors is and how to fix them to be the correct form. It can help them in remembering and applying what they have studied during writing and structure class.

The researchers having conducted the same studies in formal education found different results. Some researchers found indirect written corrective feedback is helpful in improving writing such as Goksoy (2016), she claimed indirect feedback assisted students more than direct feedback did on vocabulary and spelling errors. That finding was confirmed by a study conducted by Latifah, Suwarno, & Diani (2017) conducted the research to 136 Senior School students in Indonesia. They found teaching students' writing is better by using indirect feedback than direct feedback.


Indirect feedback provision works more effectively than direct feedback provision does in improving students' written work. It was found by Baleghizadeh & Dadashi (2011). This argument was confirmed by Ferris (2011) who said that direct feedback was helpful in short term revision but indirect feedback for a long term revision.

While Kisananto (2016) in her study to the 43 university students of IT department in Indonesia showed direct written corrective feedback assists university students increase their writing. Besides that Sadeghi, Khonbi and Gheitranzadeh (2013) whose research is about finding the effect of gender and type of WCF on Iranian pre - intermediate EFL learners' writing got the result that students who received indirect WCF did less significantly than those who received direct WCF. Jamaliesari (2015) also found the same result as Kisananto (2016) and Sadeghi, Khonbi and Gheitranzadeh (2013), he found direct corrective feedback has a bigger impact than indirect feedback.

METHOD

A true experimental design was used in this research to figure out how the effect of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on the students' writing performance is. In this study the experimental design used two-Group Pretest-Posttest. It compares experimental group one and experimental group two. The Experimental group one was given direct written corrective feedback while the experimental group Two was given indirect written corrective feedback.

Each group in this research was given the same topic of writing task but with different treatment of written corrective feedback. The treatment was conducted for five times and spent ten meetings. The treatment for experimental group one who was given direct written corrective feedback was firstly in the meeting one the tutor had the students write writing tasks, an essay and a report on a given topic. Then the students handed in their writing tasks. In the meeting two the tutor corrected their tasks then gave the direct written corrective feedback as the treatment on their tasks by circling the students' errors to know the error on their writing tasks and providing the correct form. For example: the student wrote "I go to Malang yesterday." The tutor not only circled the word "go" but also provides the correct form by changing "go" to be "went", because it was incorrect.

I  go to Malang yesterday.

Went

The tutor gave their writing tasks having been corrected by the tutor by circling the error and providing the correct form. The tutor called them one by one to get their writing tasks and the explanation about their error.

While in the experimental group two, in the meeting one the tutor had the students write writing tasks, an essay and a report on a given topic. Then the students handed in their writing tasks. In the meeting two the tutor corrected and gave indirect written corrective feedback as the treatment on their tasks by circling the students' errors to know the error on their writing tasks without providing the correct form. For example: the student wrote "I go to Malang yesterday." The tutor only circled the word "go" without providing the correct form of "go" by changing it to be "went" because he asked the students to correct it by themselves.

I  go to Malang yesterday.

The tutor gave their writing tasks having been corrected by the tutor by circling the error without providing the correction. The tutor ordered their errors revised by themselves. The tutor called them one by one to check whether the students' correction was correct or not. Therefore the students in this group did not get the correct form of their error from the tutor but they corrected it by themselves. Those treatments above were repeated until the fifth treatment.

The subject of this study was the students of intensive course of IELTS class in Titik Nol English Course who had studied English as the preparation for taking the intensive IELTS class. The numbers of the population was 21 students divided into two groups by seeing the result of their pretest so the students' ability in each class is same. There were 10 students in group A, and 11 students in group B.

The instrument for collecting the data in this research was writing test. Related to assessing the students writing performance in each task, the researcher used the scoring rubric of writing IELTS of IDP. The rubric contains what we call as IELTS writing band descriptor. There are four aspects that are measured. They are task achievement or task response, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource and grammatical range. There are ten band scores in this research which showed the students score in writing. The band score started from band score 0 as the lowest score to band score 9 the highest score or band.

In collecting the data, the students were asked to write two academic writings, writing task 1 and writing task 2. On writing task 1, it consisted of minimally 150 words and 250 words in task 2. After determining the group, the researcher gave the treatment by using direct written corrective feedback to the experimental group one and using indirect written corrective feedback to the experimental group two. At the end of the meeting the researcher gave a posttest to the two experimental groups in the form of a writing task 1 and 2. The researcher gave the posttest to the students after giving the treatment to know which group had better scores of writing skill.

The data were analyzed quantitatively by using independent sample t-test by SPSS version 25. The students' scores were then compared. In this case, the independent sample t-test was used to compare the writing performance of the experimental group one and the experimental group two prior to treatment to know whether they were equal or not. Since the comparison found that they were equal, the independent sample t-test was used again to compare the posttest score of the two groups.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this research were started from counting the score of the students in the pretest.

The Comparison of Pretest

The score between the students in experimental group one and experimental group two in pretest was compared to find out the basic ability of the students in both groups. The result are presented in the table below.

Table 1 The Comparison of Writing Performance of the Students before being Given Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback

Group Statistics					
	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	Experimental Group One	10	4.0500	.36893	.11667
	Experimental Group Two	11	3.9091	.37538	.11318

Independent Samples Test						
		t-test for Equality of Means				
		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Score	Equal variances assumed	.866	19	.397	.14091	.16269

Pursuant on the table above it informs the mean score of experimental group one before being given direct written corrective feedback was 4.0500 while the mean score of experimental group two was 3.9091. After the average values of the two groups are compared, t value .866 is obtained, which has a significant value .397. Since the significant value is .397, it means the difference is not significant. Therefore it proves the difference between the two mean values is not significant, it can be said that both experimental group one and experimental group two were equal, they have the same basic ability in pretest before they were given the treatment.

Homogeneity Test

Table 2 The homogeneity Test Variance of Experimental Group One And Experimental Group Two

Test of Homogeneity of Variances			
Posttest			
Levene's Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.322	1	19	.577

Based on the table above, the test is homogeny because sig is .577; it means that the variance data of the experimental group one and the experimental group two is equal variances assumed or Homogeny distribution. It can be concluded that students in experimental group one and experimental group two have homogeny of variances.

The Comparison of Posttest

Since the comparison of experimental group one and experimental group two was found that their difference before giving the treatment began were equal. The results were shown on the table below

Table 3 The Comparison of Writing Performance of the Students after Being Given Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback

Group Statistics					
	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	Experimental Group One	10	5.6000	.51640	.16330
	Experimental Group Two	11	4.8636	.45227	.13636

Independent Samples Test					
		t-test for Equality of Means			
		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Score	Equal variances assumed	3.484	19	.002	.73636

From the table above it is known that 5.6000 is the mean score of experimental group one given direct written corrective feedback; while the means score of experimental group two given indirect written corrective feedback was 4.8636. The t-value is 3.484 and the significance value (2-tailed) is .002. It can be deduced that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. It implies that the difference of writing performance between students given the direct written corrective feedback and those given indirect written corrective feedback is significant.

After being given treatments, the posttest writing performance of students in the experimental group one has significantly better. It means that direct written corrective is effective in assisting every student to improve their writing performance. Sadeghi, Khonbi and Gheitranszadeh (2013), Indriati (2013), Jamaliesari (2015), Kisananto (2016) and Yustina (2016) who also conducted the same research are in favor of this statement even in different level of the participants. Indriati (2013) stated that direct written corrective feedback to the eight grade's composition helps the students in writing a recount text not only in decreasing the errors but also in increasing the score.

The statement and the findings above were argued by Talatifard (2016), Westmacott (2017), Goksoy (2016) and Alhumidi (2016) and Mutiara (2018). They said that direct written corrective feedback has less effectiveness than indirect written corrective feedback in improving the writing performance of the students. Alhumidi strengthened the statement by his research to 20 Arabic intermediate students in Kuwait. He said the writing and language skills of students improve well by using indirect feedback. It was proved by seeing the students' score after being given the treatment. The score of students in experimental group one increases.

In the experimental group one, the students showed their different score before and after being given the treatment. Their band score in pretest and posttest was significantly different. It showed their writing performance is better than before. Their error decreased. It was because the tutor gave an explanation about their errors and showed them the correct form. Giving the explanation to the students assisted them in review their material when they were in the previous class before entering in intensive class. Moreover this explanation were given several

times during they did the same mistake in the previous writing task. It makes them understand well about the material. It was also because the tutor's feedback was clear enough to be understood by them. If they did not understand, they could ask to the tutor. When doing this treatment the tutor found the difficulties in conducting it. He was lack of the time therefore in one meeting he could not cover all the students since it needed a lot of time between the tutor and the students while during the class they only had 90 minutes.

Different from the experimental group two, after the tutor returned the writing tasks of the students he then asked the students to revise their writing tasks with errors circled by the tutor and they had to hand in it again to the tutor. The students had to do it by themselves. In the next meeting, they were called one by one by the tutor to come forward and brought their writing tasks. The tutor only checked their correction and asked them to revise it again if their correction was incorrect. Some students looked enthusiast and active to this feedback because they were able to review their material in grammar, vocabulary and writing. They wanted to measure their ability because doing the correction without any help from tutor or their friends.

This group represented the mean of students in pretest was smaller than the mean score of the students in the post test, it means descriptively there is the significant different mean of students score between pretest and posttest. It can be concluded that indirect written corrective feedback has the significant effect because this feedback gives the effect to students' ability in writing performance. They can decrease their errors and increase their band score. It means using indirect written corrective feedback in teaching writing is effective.

The statement above is confirmed by Latifah, Suwarno, & Diani (2017) that indirect written corrective feedback makes the students to be independent in writing since they remember their error before so they do not do it again in the next writing class. It happens when the tutor had the correct form of their error circled by their tutor found out. But when the researcher conducted the treatment several days after the class the students did the errors again. It was also found by Dharma (2017) in research to the university students. She found that the students also still make the same mistake as before.

Besides that the researcher figured out in this study that in implementing indirect corrective feedback the students need a longer time to correct the error whereas during revising their error they only gave eight minutes for each student. It made them hurry in doing their revision. Because of that they were confused and unsure about their correction. Shirotha (2016) suggested too that the time of indirect feedback treatment should be longer.

In this research the score of the students in experimental group one is higher than that in experimental group two. It occurs because of their habit since they were in intermediate class where in writing class they were used to get the correction and explanation directly from the tutor about their errors. Therefore when given indirect written corrective feedback they were shocked. It makes them a little bit lazy when the tutor asked them to revise their error by themselves. The laziness of the students when they were given indirect written corrective feedback here does not means that it is the culture of mostly students in Indonesia like what some people said that our young generation is the lazy generation. This statement was argued by the findings from the researchers who conducted the same research in Indonesia.

It can be seen in the research conducted by Rachmawati (2017) and Shirotha (2016) to students in Indonesia too. They found that direct written corrective feedback is less helpful to improve the writing performance of the students even these findings were found in the formal education. Therefore it could not be related to the findings in this research and the cultural background of the students in Indonesia.

By seeing the comparison data in the independent t-test it showed the clear result that direct written corrective feedback is more effective, Since the students who were given the direct feedback achieve the higher score than those who were given the indirect written corrective feedback.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

On account of the findings of this research it was found giving the direct written corrective feedback makes the students' score higher than giving indirect written corrective feedback. Hence, it could be concluded that the students given direct written corrective feedback achieve significantly better writing performance than the students given indirect written corrective feedback in Intensive course. It means direct written corrective feedback is more effective than indirect written corrective feedback in improving the writing performance of the students in intensive course.

Having conducted the research, the researcher proposes some suggestions for the English teachers, and other researchers. It is suggested to the English teacher or tutor to be able to apply and explore more deeply

about the using of written corrective feedback in improving the writing performance of students. While to the other researchers it is suggested to conduct the further research in finding out the short-term and long-term effect of written corrective feedback in the non-formal education.

REFERENCE

- Baleghizadeh, S., & Dadashi, M. 2011. The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on Students' Spelling Errors. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 13(1), 129-137.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. 2012. *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*. London: Routledge.
- Crystal, D. 2003. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (5th ed.). London: blackwell.
- Elham, Almasi. 2014. The Effects of Direct vs. Indirect Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research Volume 3*, Issue 1, 2016, pp. 74-85.
- Farjadnasab, A. H & Khodashenas, M. R. 2017. The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Students' Writing. *International Journal of Research in English Education*.
- Ferris, D. 2011. *Treatment of error in second language student writing (2nd Ed.)*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Goksoy, A. S. 2016. The Effect of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on Students Writing. *International Journal of Yasamda Liderlik*.
- Indriati, A. 2013. *The Effect of Direct Corrective Feedback on Eight Graders' Compositions*. State University of Malang.
- Jamalinesari, A. 2015. The Effect of Teacher-Written Direct Vs. Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing. *Procardia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192.116-123.
- Kisnanto, Y., P. 2016. The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback on Higher Education Students' Writing Accuracy. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sastra*. University of Kristen Satya Wacana.
- Latifah, Y., Suwarno, B., & Diani, I. 2017. *The Effect of Teachers' Direct And Indirect Feedback on students Writing Ability*. *Social Science*. 19. 63-70. University of Malaysia Utara.
- Riani, S. 2016. *Improving Students' Writing Ability in Recount Text through Indirect Feedback at the First Grade of SMA Negri 5 Bandar Lampung*. Unpublished Thesis. Department of English Education. Universitas Negri Lampung.
- Salimi, A., & Ahmadvpour, M. 2015. The Effect of Direct Vs. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on L2 Learners Written Accuracy in ELF Context. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*.
- Westmacott, A. Direct vs. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback: Student Perception, *Medellin Colombia*, Vol. 22, (Chile: Universidad Chileno-Británica de Cultura, 2017), p. 25 – 29.